DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 419 885 UD 032 362

AUTHOR Reed, Patricia; Roberts, Ann
TITLE An Investigation of Leadership in Effective and Noneffective Urban Schoolwide Project Schools.
PUB DATE 1998-04-00
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April 13-17, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Attitude Measures; Compensatory Education; Construct Validity; Educational Change; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Teachers; *Instructional Leadership; *Principals; Tables (Data); Test Validity; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS Improving Americas Schools Act 1994 Title I; *Ohio

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this study was to determine whether the nature of leadership in Ohio Title I Schoolwide Project Schools that were deemed effective by the U.S. Department of Education differed from leadership in those Ohio Title I Schoolwide Project schools that were considered ineffective. The specific focus was to determine whether effective and ineffective schools differed with respect to the extent to which principals and the schools as a whole evidenced a bifocal, symbolic, technical, or unfocused leadership orientation. The Principal Behavior Inventory (PBI), developed to elicit principals' perceptions of their leadership styles, and the PBI-T, designed to measure teachers' perceptions of the same variables, were administered to 70 principals and 40 teachers respectively to determine construct validity. Four schools were selected from the entire sample for the district, and the principals and three teachers from each school completed the instruments. Two had bifocal (balanced between symbolic and technical leadership) principals, according to the PBI and PBI-T, and two had unfocused principals. The four schools are described in detail. In the effective school headed by a bifocal principal, both the principal and the teachers showed a bifocal orientation and worked together for technical and symbolic dimensions of their work. In the effective school with an unfocused principal, the school as a whole was bifocal, and leadership was diffused. In the ineffective school headed by a bifocal principal, the school was characterized by confusion and mistrust stemming from its previous administration. The ineffective school with the unfocused principal demonstrated an overall unfocused leadership orientation. Overall, findings show that both of the effective schools evidenced a bifocal schoolwide leadership orientation and both of the ineffective schools evidenced an unfocused schoolwide leadership orientation. Appendixes contain the principal and teacher interview protocols. (Contains 9 tables and 27 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 419 885

An Investigation of Leadership in Effective and Noneffective Urban Schoolwide Project Schools

Presented by

Patricia Reed, Bowling Green State University

Ann Roberts, Maumee City Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia Reed

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting
San Diego
April, 1998

UD039362

An Investigation of Leadership in Effective and Noneffective

Urban Schoolwide Project Schools

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine whether the nature of leadership in Ohio Title 1 Schoolwide Project schools that were deemed as effective by the U. S. Department of Education differed from the nature of leadership in Ohio Title 1 Schoolwide Project schools that were deemed as being noneffective. Specifically, the study was concerned with determining if effective Schoolwide Project schools differed from noneffective Schoolwide Project schools with respect to the extent to which the principals and the school as a whole evidenced a bifocal, symbolic, technical or unfocused leadership orientation.

Background

Schools that are very similar in terms of demographic variables which have been linked to student achievement are often very different in terms of school processes and outcomes. Such is the case with Ohio Title 1 Schoolwide Project Schools. Some of these schools have been so successful in improving both school processes and student outcomes that they have been awarded the Secretary's Award from the U.S. Office of Education. In contrast, many others have been placed on program improvement, a title that the Office of Federal Assistance in the U.S. Department of Education gives to schools that are not achieving their initial process and student achievement goals.

Based on their recent review of the latest generation of studies on the relationship between the principal's role and school effectiveness, Hallinger & Heck (1996a;1996b), concluded that research has demonstrated the impact of principals' leadership on a variety of school processes and school outcomes as well as other indicators of effectiveness (e.g. Bamburg & Andrews, 1990; Brewer, 1993; Eberts & Stone, 1988; Hallinger, Bickman, & Davis, 1990; Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides, 1990; Leithwood, 1994; Scott & Teddlie, 1987). But Hallinger & Heck (1997) also reported a convergence of findings that included principal leadership

within a framework of contextual and school-level processes that influence outcomes. Thus they concluded that the impact principals have upon school processes and outcomes may be more indirect than direct in nature. However, despite the number of empirical studies which have provided increasing evidence that the leadership exercised by principals directly or indirectly impacts school processes and outcomes, much remains to be learned with respect to what constitutes effective school leadership. As Ogawa and Bossert (1995) have noted, a limitation of much of the research on school leadership is that it is based on the assumption that leadership is a function of formal organizational roles. Ogawa and Bossert contended that leadership flows throughout the organization, regardless of formal prescriptions. Leadership is thus an organizational quality and studies of school leadership must take into consideration the nature of leadership as it manifests itself throughout the school.

Additionally, there is growing evidence that effective leadership is both symbolic and technical in nature. The tension between the technical or managerial aspects of leadership and the moral or symbolic aspects of leadership has been the thrust of a plethora of studies of school leadership since Burns' (1978) seminal analysis of leadership which first introduced the concepts of transactional and transformative leadership. Although Burns conceptualized transactional and transformational leadership as constituting opposite poles of a leadership continuum, Aviolio and Bass (1988) argued that both transactional and transformational leadership are necessary in schools. Transactional leadership is necessary for organizational maintenance and transformational leadership is necessary to stimulate change. More recently Leithwood's (1994) research led him to conclude that transactional practices are positive elements of a larger set of transformational practices having to do with purposes, people, structure, and culture. Gardner's (1995b) recent examination of the nature of leadership led him to conclude that effective leadership includes both a technical and a symbolic dimension. While Gardner considered the nature of the domain or context within which individuals exercise leadership to be a significant factor in determining what constitutes effective leadership, he emphasized the need "to appreciate central paradoxes in the practice of leadership . . . the

tension between technical expertise that is necessary for sound judgments and a concern for larger goals and values that can never by dictated by techne alone" (Gardner, 1995a, p. 34).

Empirical examinations of the extent to which principals as well as schools as a whole demonstrate leadership which gives adequate attention to both the technical and symbolic aspects of leadership are few in number. According to Reitzig (1994), *The Leadership Paradox: Balancing Logic and Artistry in the Schools* (Deal and Peterson, 1994) represented the most extensive practical examination of this question as of that time. Subsequent studies (Reed, Smith, Kasch, & Sanders, 1995; Reed, Smith, & Beekley, 1996; Reed, Smith & Beekley, 1997) which were designed to test the validity of the theoretical framework set forth by Deal and Peterson, indicated that principals could be differentiated with respect to whether they evidenced a bifocal (balanced) as compared to a primarily symbolic or technical leadership orientation. Results of these studies also indicated that some principals appeared to place little emphasis upon either the symbolic or technical aspects of leadership. However, none of these studies addressed the nature of leadership throughout the school or attempted to ascertain if there was a relationship between the nature of schoolwide leadership and school processes or outcomes.

Design of the Study

Method and Instrumentation

Phase one. The first phase of this study was designed to elicit an initial determination of principals' leadership orientations based on responses of principals and their teachers to the Principal Behavior Inventory (PBI). The Principal Behavior Inventory is a self-report instrument which consists of two forms. The PBI-P elicits principals' perceptions of the reasons they perform certain functions and of attributes which are associated with carrying out certain symbolic or technical functions. The PBI-T elicits teachers' perceptions of these same variables as they apply to respondents' respective principals. The PBI yields scores on two scales. One scale measures the extent to which principals demonstrate a symbolic orientation. The other scale measures the extent to which principals demonstrate a technical orientation.

The construct validity of the instrumentation was established through using a panel of experts, including the authors of *The Leadership Paradox*, to substantiate that the items on each scale were consistent with the theoretical framework undergirding the instrument. The reliability of the instrumentation was initially determined by administering the PBI-P and PBI-T to 70 elementary and secondary principals and 40 elementary and secondary teachers. Calculations of Cronbach's *Coefficient Alpha* yielded coefficients of .83 on both the symbolic and technical scales of the PBI-P and .85 on the symbolic and .93 on the technical scales of the PBI-T. Two subsequent studies yielded similar results. In a study reported by Smith (1996), coefficients of .86 on the symbolic scale and .91 on the technical scale of the PBI-P and .87 on the symbolic and .92 on the technical scales of the PBI-T were obtained. In another study (Reed, Smith, & Beekley, 1996) involving 577 secondary principals, coefficients of .89 and .88 were obtained on the symbolic and technical scales of the PBI-P.

The studies conducted by Smith (1996) and Reed, Smith, & Beekley (1996) also examined the validity of the PBI-P using qualitative methodologies which involved on site interviews of principals and observations of their schools. Findings of both of these studies supported the validity of the PBI-P in identifying principals' leadership orientations.

Phase two. The second phase of this study utilized a case study approach. All of the principals of the four schools selected for further investigation in the second phase of the study were contacted by phone to ascertain their willingness to participate in the study by scheduling on-site visitations which involved interviews with both the principal and 3 teachers as well as an opportunity to tour the building. All indicated they would be willing to participate. Prior to the on-site visitation, the principals were mailed a copy of the questions to which they would be asked to respond (see Appendix A).

Each principal was asked to provide the names of three teachers who also would agree to to participate in the study by being interviewed. All teachers who participated were asked to respond to three questions (see Appendix B) but additional questions were also asked as the interview progressed to elicit more in-depth responses with respect to the overall leadership

orientation of the school.

All principals were interviewed during the on-site visitations to the schools. Interviews with all but 6 teachers were conducted during the on-site visitations. The remaining teacher interviews were conducted by telephone. All on-site interviews were audio recorded and subsequently transcribed verbatim. Responses elicited in the telephone interviews were recorded in writing by the interviewer as nearly to verbatim as possible without unduly prolonging the interviews. The principal interviews ranged from an hour to an hour and a half in length. Teacher interviews ranged in length from 30 to 50 minutes. Follow-up telephone calls were also made to to clarify some responses and elicit further information.

During the on-site visitations all of the principals also conducted a tour of their buildings. As possible, during these tours, comments of the principals were audio recorded. Prior to and after the interviews and tours of the buildings, notes regarding the nature of the school setting, artifacts displayed in the schools, the demeanors of principals and teachers, and interactions among staff and students were recorded.

Sample

Phase one. The initial target population for the first phase of the study was established as all the principals and a random sample of teachers in the seven Ohio Schoolwide Project schools that had been classified as effective (i.e., honored) by the U. S. Department of Education and the principals and a random sample of teachers in seven Ohio Schoolwide Project Schools randomly selected from the 18 that were classified as noneffective (i.e., placed on program improvement) by the U.S. Department of Education. All of the Schoolwide Project Schools were elementary schools. All were located in large urban school districts and served predominantly minority students. All had overall student enrollments of which at least 75% qualified for free or reduced lunches.

Due to a low response rate, particularly in the noneffective schools, the actual sample for the first phase of the study included principals and teachers from only 8 of the schools which comprised the initial target population. Five of these schools had been deemed effective

by the U.S. Department of Education and three had been deemed ineffective. The sample for the 5 effective schools consisted of the principal and 3 teachers from two schools, the principal and 2 teachers from one school, and the principal and I teacher from I school. The sample the noneffective schools consisted of the principal and 3 teachers from 2 of schools and the principal and 2 teachers from I school.

Demographic information with with respect to principals and the schools involved in the phase of the study is presented in Table 1.

[Insert Table 1 here.]

Phase two. The schools which were included in the second phase of the study were selected to be most representative of the leadership orientations which were evidenced by the principals in both the effective and noneffective schools. Given results of the analysis of the data collected in Phase One, two schools with bifocal principals and two schools with unfocused principals were selected for further investigation. The actual sample consisted of the principal and 3 teachers from each of the four schools. Demographic information with respect to these four schools is presented in Table 2.

[Insert Table 2 here.]

Data Analysis

Phase one. The first step in analyzing the data collected in Phase One of the study was to analyze the responses of the principals to the PBI-P. The aggregate mean scores and standard deviations for the responses of all eight principals to both the symbolic and technical scales of the PBI-P were calculated. To identify the principals' leadership orientations, the aggregate mean scores on both the symbolic and technical scales of the PBI-P for each principal were calculated and transformed into *z* scores. Based on the *z* score, the leadership orientation of each principal was determined (see Table 3) and the type of school (effective or ineffective) associated with each leadership orientation identified.

[Insert Table 3 here.]

The aggregate mean scores and standard deviations for the responses of all teachers to

both the symbolic and technical scales of the PBI-T were then calculated. To identify each principal's leadership orientation, the aggregate mean scores on both the symbolic and technical scales for the teachers in each of the eight schools were calculated and transformed into *z* scores. Teachers' perceptions of the leadership orientations of their respective principals and the type of school associated with each leadership orientation were then determined using essentially the same procedures as used in analyzing principals' responses. Results of the analysis of responses to the PBI-P and the PBI-T were then compared to determine the extent of agreement between each principals' leadership orientation as indicated by these two measures.

Phase two. The first step in the data analysis for Phase Two involved using a form of inductive analysis known as unitizing, coding, and categorizing (Lincoln & Guba, 1984; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Unitizing of the data involved identifying specific phrases, sentences, or paragraphs in the interview transcripts and on-site observation notes which conveyed a singular meaning. As these unit of meaning were extracted, they were coded so as to indicate the source of the data (school, principal interview, teacher interview or, observation notes) and the orientation of the principal as determined in the first phase of the study. The units of meaning were then separated into categories according to the school to which they pertained. The units of meaning in each school category were then further divided into sub-categories in terms of the meaning they conveyed with respect to the nature of (a) the principal's leadership, (b) the leadership exercised by other individuals or groups throughout the school, and (c) features of the particular school context. Those units of meaning which did not fit into any of these categories were categorized as "extraneous" and not used in the subsequent data analysis.

Once this process was completed, those units of meaning associated with each school were examined to ascertain predominant themes which were reflected in each of the three sub-categories.

Findings

Phase One

Means and standard deviations for principals' responses to the symbolic and technical

scales of the PBI-P are presented in Table 4. The aggregate means scores and the *z* scores for each of the eight principals' responses to the symbolic and technical scales of the PBI-P are presented in Table 5. Principals' classifications with respect to leadership orientation with respect to type of school are presented in Table 6.

[Insert Tables 4, 5, and 6 here.]

Mean scores and standard deviations for teachers' responses to the symbolic and technical scales of the PBI-T are presented in Table 7. Mean scores with respect to the aggregate means and *z* scores for teachers' responses in each school on each of the scales are presented in Table 8.

[Insert Tables 7 and 8 here.]

As Table 9 indicates, in all but two of the schools, results of administration of the PBI indicated that principals' leadership orientations as indicated by the PBI-P and the PBI-T were consistent. However, in one of the effective schools, one principal was identified by the PBI-P as having a technical leadership orientation and by the PBI-T as having a bifocal orientation. In one of the noneffective schools, one principal was identified by the PBI-P as having a bifocal leadership orientation and by the PBI-T as having an unfocused orientation.

[Insert Table 9 here.]

Phase Two

Findings of the study with respect to the nature of the principal's leadership, the nature of leadership exercised by other individuals in the school, and contextual factors that characterized each of the four schools are presented first. These findings are presented in narrative form and include examples of principals' and teachers' verbatim comments as well as descriptions of the school settings. Findings with respect to the 2 schools in which the principals were classified as bifocal are presented first followed by findings for the 2 schools in which the principals were classified as unfocused[1]. These narratives are followed by summaries of the findings as they relate to (a) the leadership orientations of the principals, (b) the overall schoolwide leadership, and (c) the contextual variables that characterized the

[1] The names used for all schools and individuals are fictitious to protect their anonymity.

effective as compared to noneffective schools.

Conway School. The community around the expressway exit leading to Conway School is filled with small houses with well-kept lawns and chain stores and restaurants in close proximity, but on Conway Road, the neighborhood changes rapidly. The nationally recognized stores diminish and are replaced with local shops and store-front churches with protective bars on the windows. Farther on, corner bars and liquor stores with people loitering about holding paper-bagged covered bottles are frequently seen.

It would be easy to drive by Conway School, even though it sits on the corner of a main street because of the over-grown lawn, the paint-chipped window frames, the broken windows, the pot-holed asphalt parking lot/playground and gang signs painted on the side of the building. To a passerby the building appears uninhabited. There is no sign to herald the entrance or to assist visitors in finding the appropriate door. The first door that was approached by the interviewer was locked but a buzzer outside the side door granted entrance to the school. Once inside Conway Primary School, the tone was different. The interior of the building was clean and well kept with lightly painted walls. However, there were few decorations on the walls.

Conway Primary School is in the heart of a large urban school district in financial difficulty. The lack of resources was reflected not only in the outside appearance of the school, but also within. Plastic was used to cover the windows in the winter to keep out the cold and the plaster was falling off the walls in many places throughout the building. The week previous to the visitation, one classroom had to be evacuated due to the collapse of the roof.

Conway Primary housed approximately 350 pre-school to third grade students at the time of the visitation, a drop from the previous year's enrollment of 421 students. Eighty nine percent of Conway's students were on free or reduced lunch. Ninety six and four tenths percent of the students at Conway were African American, 2.6 percent Caucasian, 0.2 percent Asian, and 0.7 percent Hispanic.

Donald Kohn, the principal of Conway Primary School has been an educator for 28 years, 17 of those years as an administrator, mostly at Conway. Mr. Kohn's office was plain and

uncluttered. On his desk were pictures of his family. In one bookcase were manuals and resource guides. Posted on the bulletin board by the side of his desk was a newspaper article about the school entitled "Success Amid the Chaos" and a list of the seven tenets of effective schools.

During the interview, Mr. Kohn repeatedly expressed his pride in his school and its programs, teachers, students and their accomplishments. Yet he never once mentioned that his school was honored the previous year with the Secretary's Award from the U. S. Department of Education. He repeatedly stressed the high standards of achievement and expectations at Conway.

> We do have problems and can't always do what we want to do but just because they live in the city does not mean that they can't learn. So, all of our teachers really have some high expectations and I think the second thing is that they work to meet those expectations.

The theme of high student expectations was a recurring one in the interviews with the teachers. One teacher stated:

> It's amazing. This is second grade and I'm having them write a story and answer those questions. [pointing to the board]. I'm not just giving them two or three lines. In math we practice regrouping and then they know it down pat and we're writing. We work these kids. Very high expectations. Even the parents. One mother whose son just moved here couldn't believe the high standards at Conway. Her son is getting Cs here.

Repeatedly, throughout the interviews with both Mr. Kohn and the staff members, mention was made of the ways teachers work together to improve student learning. For example, Mr. Kohn noted that:

> The teachers saw that there were some students in the classroom that were so disruptive or so behind in their work, that it was just pulling the whole class down. So we thought what can we do to help these children. We don't want them to fall through the cracks. What can we do? So we actually did this without Title 1 funding. We decided to try this new classroom. So they were willing to try that.

Another teacher discussed how student learning was so important to teachers that they worked in the summer without pay.

> I remember working in the summer time. Our curriculum for 3rd grade was really poor. So we met at a teacher's house in the summer and we took books that when you turned the pages, they would actually fall apart. We sat there and we chose what we thought was important. Went with the curriculum but we did it all because we had

nothing else. We couldn't do it during school time so we just did it in the summer and it worked well. I think we work well together.

The physical education teacher who was only in the building part-time believed that he had an outside perspective that allowed him to compare Conway to the other schools he serviced. About Conway he said:

> I think the strengths I see are in regards to the classroom teachers and the things they are doing upstairs and around the building. What they are doing with the students and how some of their test scores are compared to other students in the city, it's got to be very positive, what's going on in there. We're very helpful to one another. If there is a problem or situation that arises, most of the faculty is very flexible and can change at a moment's notice.

Comments of both the principal and teachers included examples of how the principal's values as well as the shared values of the school aided in the decision making for student programming. Mr. Kohn discussed some of the creative adjustments in curriculum and staffing that he and the teachers had implemented as a way of helping all children to achieve. Their shared value of high achievement apparently leads this staff to bend the rules to accommodate learning and growth for the students. This was illustrated by the following comment by Mr. Kohn:

> I also had a class of 3rd graders. They were not SBH students, but they were students who were not succeeding because of their behavior, but they weren't bad enough to be put in SBH classes. We took out kids between 10 and 12. There was no testing or anything like that. The teachers who had those children in the 2nd grade, we picked out the 12 that needed the most. They were put in a classroom together and we had a teacher who worked with them. She did a lot of work with their behavior, lessons and that kind of thing and she also had a very small class. She had to do more individualized kinds of things with them. So it saved the other classes because the real problems weren't in there anymore.

The teacher observed that:

> Mr. Kohn was kind enough to let me really do whatever I wanted to get these kids interested in school again. To get them to like school one more time. So what I did was I threw away the basals. I didn't use those and I brought in trade books. A lot of hands-on projects. I did away with the workbooks.

Mr. Kohn indicated that, for the most part, he does not have problems with the teachers' union even though he violated some union rules when he believed it was for the good of the

children.

> I don't have a problem with any of the union stuff. Most of the rules don't bother me. They're all right. I don't have any problem with it. I break one union rule at the beginning of every year and that's the first day of school. The teachers are supposed to send their children to the special subjects - art, music, and so forth-so they [teachers] get planning period right from the beginning. I break that every year. We don't do it and they miss their planning on the first day of school. My philosophy is that they get familiar with their teacher, get comfortable with their surroundings and so forth. Just one day, and I think they have enough turmoil going in their lives that they don't need one more thing.

None of the teachers made any reference to this violation or mentioned any types of union problems.

Although the school had limited financial resources, Mr. Kohn appeared to manage the limited resources in a manner that was cost effective, but also promoted the values of the school. Mr. Kohn indicated that resource allocation was one of his strengths and that he believed it was very important to give priority in allocating resources to services and materials that would promote student achievement. He illustrated this by indicating how he had supported teachers' requests to take students on field trips and to purchase instructional materials. He indicated he believed this sent a message of support to his teacher. Teachers also commented on the manner in which resources were allocated. One teacher explained:

> I mean we can use the Xerox machine, no problem. I can make as many copies. Some of them [teachers in other buildings] have to count them. I don't have to pay for laminating. I have paper. I have special chalk, so our secretary says you don't have to buy it, I'll get it for you. Marking pencils, everything. Things you think you'd have to buy, no. We have the supplies, I have books. He [Mr. Kohn]bought the phonics books which were not part of the budget.

Mr. Kohn's actions with respect to resource allocation thus appeared to serve both a technical and symbolic function. From a technical perspective, Mr. Kohn made sure resources were deployed to maximize instructional outcomes. But his actions also transmitted a clear symbolic message that he valued his teacher's work and their commitment to fostering student achievement.

That leadership within Conway School was not perceived to be limited to the principal or teachers was evident when interviewees were asked about other sources of leadership within the

building. Both the principal and teachers named Mrs. Tiney, the secretary. She was an older woman with a gruff demeanor who appeared to take on a number of technical and symbolic leadership roles. For one, she served as a gatekeeper who "sees who comes in, who leaves, and how the organization relates to its external constituencies." (Deal and Peterson, 1994, p.29) She served as an anthropological detective who was attuned to the informal communication network in the school. She"gossiped" with parents who came into the building She also and served as a priestess in the school, "a longtime resident who 'ministers' to the needs of the schools." (p.29) This latter role was illustrated by a story told by Mr. Kohn about the school receiving a call from the public library down the street concerning one of Conway's students. One boy was in the library alone during the middle of the day. Upon investigation, Mrs. Tiney found that the child was a morning kindergartner, who should have been home. The secretary then called the mother who said she knew that the boy was at the library. Mrs. Tiney proceeded to give a parenting lesson to the mother, " You can't send your baby alone to the library, not in this neighborhood. Someone could snatch him. Now go get him." Mr. Kohn felt that this incident was just one example of how Mrs. Tiney was influential in working with the families and children at Conway.

Overall, Mr. Kohn's and teachers' responses to the interview questions as well as the observation data yielded numerous indications that Mr. Kohn emphasized various symbolic and technical functions and thus evidenced a bifocal leadership orientation. Interview responses and observation data also revealed numerous indications that the school as a whole was bifocal in its overall leadership orientation in that staff throughout the school were also carrying out many important symbolic and technical functions.

Mayfair Park. From a distance, Mayfair Park School looks like a quiet neighborhood school. Mayfair Park sits upon a hill and overlooks a small lake where geese come for food. But on closer inspection, it can be seen that this 75 year old brick building is situated in the center of a decaying urban community. Across the street from the school are several abandoned buildings and a small convenience store with bars on the windows. At one time this

neighborhood had been well-kept with most residents owning their homes and retiring there. Now many of the homes are low income rental property and the population transient.

At the time this study was conducted, Mayfair Park Elementary School served 630 students in grades kindergarten through six. Seventy-four percent of the students were African American, 22% Caucasian, 2% Hispanic, and 2% Asian. Ninety-one percent of these students participated in the free and reduced lunch and breakfast program.

On the day of the visitation, a banner was flying outside Mayfair Park School which advertised it as a Montessori Magnet School. The yard around the school was well-maintained and near the lake was a playground but with limited equipment. Student work adorned the windows of the classrooms and above the front entrance the windows were painted with tulips. To gain admittance to Mayfair Park, it was necessary to push a buzzer. A decorated sign on the door requested that visitors report to the office upon arrival.

The interior of Mayfair Park conveyed a warm, friendly feeling possibly due in part to the notable deviation from the pale yellow and green paint commonly used on school walls. Mayfair's halls were painted with a lightly textured pink paint with purple metallic flecks. The woodwork trim was purple. The walls were adorned with colorful posters as well as many displays of student work. The overall effect was a warm and inviting ambience.

On the day of visitation, the main office at Mayfair Park was bustling with teachers, parents and students. Both the main office and the office of the principal, Mildred Jones, was neat, bright, and decorated with educational posters as well as personal belongings. The posters had inspirational messages on them and seemed to be intended to send a message that education and children were important at Mayfair Park. The school's motto of "Respect your self, respect others, and respect your environment" hung in several places around the school. Inside Ms. Jones's office, personal artifacts included an apple collection and country craft items in red, white and blue. Her office gave the impression of being her home as well as her place of work.

Ms. Jones is about 5'4", was well-dressed and, during the building tour, walked briskly though the halls in her high heels. It seemed apparent in the way people received her that she

was well liked even though she had only been the principal at Mayfair Park for two years. She indicated that her visibility and the appearance of her school were important to her.

Change has been a constant at Mayfair Park for the past four years. Four years ago the principal of 20 years retired. A new principal was brought in, but only lasted 2 years. She asked for a transfer because of the many problems, predominately with student discipline. The district administration had also announced that it intended to implement a magnet school concept and Mayfair Park was to become a Montessori School. The school applied to become a Title 1 Schoolwide Project as a means of providing funding for the Montessori equipment. Ms. Jones, who had been the assistant principal at the school across the lake, was made principal. She told about how the directives concerning Montessori came from central office and the circumstances under which she came to Mayfair Park two years ago.

> The biggest problem was that when our wonderful superintendent decided he wanted magnet schools, he had somebody downtown write the grant for magnet schools and they were looking for another school because they had technology and science. So they pulled Montessori and nobody downtown knew what Montessori was, had any idea, had not a clue. Most of the people had been here, I think the least seniority member had been here eight years, but many of them have been here 16-17 years. They [central office staff] walked into a spring staff meeting and said next year this will be a Montessori School. You have to take Montessori training which is two years and which we will pay for and we will also pay for the masters. It is nice unless you've worked 20 years and who wants to do that. Really, all hell broke loose here is what happened. That spring, 25 of the 26 classroom teachers left. ...
>
> Anyway, I laid down my expectations and the teachers that had been here said these kids will never do this. They had not a clue. They didn't do it the year before. I heard horror stories. It was just running and screaming through the hallway. They'd get up and leave class.

This was the context in which Mildred Jones began two years ago. With change comes conflict and Ms. Jones was very open about the conflict and stress within her staff. As part of the Montessori philosophy, the students are to be grouped into multi-age classrooms. This year the primary began the multi-age classroom grouping while the intermediate grades retained their previous age structure. The original plan was that next year the intermediate grades would move to the multi-age system. However, some of the teachers at the intermediate level were resistant. This resistance to one of the major tenets of Montessori was one of the sources

of conflict within the school. Ms. Jones noted this in her comments.

> It used to be worse than it is now, but the joke around the district was that the union had a branch office at Mayfair. And new teachers, they think nothing of calling the union. I would have never had the nerve to do something like that when I was starting out. We are starting to get things worked out so the union stuff is not as frequent.

Ms. Jones' infusion in her work of communication of high expectations for the students while maintaining order, thereby giving attention to both the symbolic and technical aspects of her work was demonstrated by a story she told.

> Of course, that's really what I preached all year long was expectations. When I said the children are going to line up before they come into school in the morning, they [the teachers] looked at me and said yeah, right. They're [the students] all over here. I said Oh no. We don't play on the playground before school. We do line up. Something very simple and they did it. They did it, that's all.

Also indicative of this blending of symbolic and technical roles, were her actions while conducting a tour of the building. During this tour, she greeted everyone, stopped to talk to various people and frequently touched whomever she talked with either on the arm or with a hug. But also when walking through the halls, she gently reminded a student to walk rather than run and stooped to pick up paper from the floor.

Ms. Jones indicated that she believed that conflict resolution was not her strength, but pointed out that one strategy she used to diffuse confrontation was to utilize informal networks.

> Most of them know what's happening. They know at the other Montessori building what's happening before I do. Once you say something, I'm sure you've seen that, to one person, bingo. They're all teaching and you're going how do they know this. It hasn't been an hour and everybody in the building knows it. You've got to learn to take that and work to your advantage so you know there's something that is not kosher and you can say it to somebody. Many times I will say, I heard that at such-and-such school they did this. I know none of my teachers would do that. There is some advantage to that same network that can do you in. It can also save you.

Thus, Ms. Jones attached importance to being an anthropological detective, one of the symbolic roles identified by Deal and Peterson (1994).

The teachers who were interviewed agreed that the behavior of students had greatly improved during Ms. Jones's tenure. One teacher also commented on the change in tone since Ms. Jones came.

> Everyone can feel her spirit in the building. But it wasn't always that way. The old principal was very loving, a nice person but allowed kids to get away with things. She felt sorry for them because of the neighborhood so she would make excuses. She had no expectations for the kids. It was so bad around here that one day a crossing guard was beat up by a gang member. Since she [Ms. Jones] came guns and violence has decreased. She sets a tone for a learning environment.

Ms. Jones' high expectations for the students appears to be reflected in her decision making. One staff member stated that it is not uncommon for Ms. Jones to make a statement like "I understand where you're coming from, but it's not in the best interest of the children." She then said, "She's there for the children even though it may not be the most popular thing to do in every situation."

Another teacher said of the changes within the building:

> Our school has come so far in two years. Before she came, the building was in total disarray, total chaos. She gained control and respect.

Ms. Jones discussed the fact that she tried to share decision making within the school. But so many changes were needed when she came that decisions needed to be made quickly so she made them. With respect to decision making, all the teachers who were interviewed pointed to the lack of shared decision making. However, their comments differed with respect to why decision making was more unilateral than shared.

> The previous principal had no leadership. Now we have a very strong principal who likes power. She wants to delegate, but doesn't always do it successfully.
>
> She [Ms. Jones] tried to have shared leadership, but people were committeed out. With everyone going to school, at night and on weekends, it is easier to just let her make the decisions.

Both Ms. Jones and the staff members thus appeared unclear as to how decisions should be made.

Overall, the leadership exercised by Ms. Jones over the past two years appeared to represent a positive change for teachers. However, the legacy of the chaos that existed during the tenures of previous building administrators and the more recent central office magnet school mandate appeared to continue to create barriers to the school developing a shared vision and a culture that supported that vision. Thus, while the principal appeared to evidence a

bifocal leadership orientation, the overall leadership orientation of the school appeared to be unfocused.

Robertson School. Robertson School is a two story brick facility set amidst dilapidated houses and small neighborhood stores which are surrounded by factories and rail yards. The residences in the neighborhood in days past had been occupied mostly by working class parents who were employed in these factories or rail yards, and Robertson School educated their children. But this is no longer the case. Most of the workers in these factories and rail yards now live in suburban communities and many of the current residents of this school community are unemployed. The building itself was closed in 1980, but later reopened by a federal court order to ensure racial balance within the district. The students at Robertson now are drawn not only from the local neighborhood but also bussed from a nearby low-income housing unit. Resultantly, 89% of the students at Robertson are eligible for the free or reduced lunch programs.

The outside of Robertson is clean and well-maintained. A playground is located at the side of the school. At the time of the visitation, a banner waved outside the entrance which recognized Robertson Achievement School as an elementary magnet school, one of many within this urban school district. At the front door a sign directed visitors to the office, but a buzzer was needed to gain admittance. To reach the main office, a flight of steps must be climbed. At the top of the steps in the foyer is a large board on which the school's mission was emblazoned. A set of double doors at the top of the steps opens into a large common space with many hallways and classrooms stemming from this common space. The main office is adjacent to this common space. On the door of the main office was a smaller version of the mission sign that hung in the main foyer.

At the time this study was conducted, Robertson School serviced 541 students in kindergarten through fifth grade. Sixty-five and two tenths percent of the students were African-American, 33.3% Caucasian, 0.4% Asian and 1.1% Hispanic. With respect to the magnet school concept, Robertson is described as a school which focuses on the basics of reading,

mathematics and writing. The students wear uniforms of blue and white which are intended to serve as a symbol of high standards. A case in the common space area displays possible uniform combinations and new parents are paraded by the case during the orientation tour of the building.

The main office was large, bright, and colorful. Many posters were hung around the room and most of these stressed parental involvement at Robertson. A waiting period for Mr. Lou Michaels, a principal of 10 years, 5 of which have been at Robertson, revealed that the office was a hub of activity. The school counselor was talking with several students about the morning's honors program. These students were wearing large wooden pins in the form of the letter P which signified being on the Principal's List. The secretary was training a student to answer the phone so she could go to lunch. The full-time school nurse had a constant flow of students in and out of her office. One of her charges came to sit by the interviewer and began a conversation. The nurse quickly and respectfully ushered the student away and later explained that the student had head lice and thus needed to be isolated. The level of poverty was evident from watching the children coming through the office. Even though the students were in uniforms, many had uniforms that were ill-fitting and dirty.

Eventually the door to Mr. Michaels' office opened and he, along with six teachers, exited. He apologized for being late, but explained that a committee meeting "ran over. " Mr. Michaels' office was large; his desk was in the middle with a computer center and counter top shelves behind him along the back wall. Every space was taken with piles of books, papers and reports. His desk appeared cluttered and unorganized. The front of his office was occupied by a large conference table and ten chairs. On the wall to the left of the conference table was a bulletin board with 20 clipboards hanging from nails. Each clipboard was covered with a red sheet entitled with a different program name. Over the bulletin board was a computer generated banner with the school motto "Together we can achieve great things."

Without much preamble, Mr. Michael began answering the interview questions that were sent to him prior to the interview. He began with a demographic description of his building and

the Title 1 Schoolwide Project funding.

> Staff, I do have right now 25 full-time teachers that are classroom teachers. I have art, music and gym. They're here 4 and 1/2 days a week. I also have three full-time Schoolwide Project teachers for Title 1. I also have seven tutors in the building. They are under Title 1.

Later Mr. Michaels also mentioned his full-time counselor, administrative assistant and nurse.

When asked about how the mission statement came into being, Mr. Michaels briefly described the process but then spoke in a rather disconnected manner about parental input and the need to lower expectations. He did not seem to be able to verbalize what specifically constituted the mission of the school.

> It was through our school-wide team. We had a subcommittee that worked on the message that we wanted adopted. It was not only staff. It also included parents. What we felt was important to the school. I think there are a couple of aspects of it, given the demographics of our neighborhood. This is probably the worst area in the city that you're going to go to as far as drugs, and so on and so forth, violence and what not. We felt it was important that one way to meet the needs of the community is make sure it's a multi-cultural program that we are offering. Things that we value as European-Americans are certainly not things that the community values. We attempt to get input from the community each year. I'll give you an example of some of the questionnaires that we sent home. The more information we have from parents, the better job we can do. We need to respond to parent concerns. This year, as a result of some of things that we've sent home, we have adjusted a couple of things on our expectations here at school. There are certain expectations we have that there will be homework every night. And we've had to adjust that. With uniforms, we had to adjust that. The appearance code, we're thinking of adjusting that.

Mr. Michaels indicated he viewed his role as one of support rather than leadership. He explained this by saying:

> There's a lot of different roles as a principal. There are a lot of major divisions within my particular role, but I think my chief role is to be the chief teacher. It's to be the leader of teachers. It's a facilitator and that's what I see myself as. If there are opportunities for the staff to grow. If there are programs they will benefit from. If there is staff development that I think they may be interested in. I view that as one of my main responsibilities. ...To find opportunities to gain resources. .....I try to be as easygoing as I possibly can be and still make sure that I'm accomplishing the tasks that I need to accomplish and giving them a lot of flexibility. I try to give them a lot of input on decisions that are made in the building.
>
> Two of my most prominent leadership attributes. I think probably encouraging and approachable. If a teacher has a problem, I want them to be able to feel they can come in here and they can discuss the problem. I may not solve the problem. I may ask them to

> help me solve the problem and encourage their thinking and to identify what's the problem. Who has the responsibility for the problem and how to handle it. I like to make sure that there is an avenue for them; if there's anything that's bothering them. Also, I think the encouragement. You encourage them to try different things to grow as a professional. Not to remain static. Again, that's the name of the game. That's very important for me.

The teachers from Robertson School were very talkative when they discussed the Schoolwide Project and all the programs at Robertson, but appeared somewhat uncomfortable when asked to talk about Mr. Michaels' leadership. Although the responses of the teachers were positive, they were brief and referred primarily to Mr. Michaels' interactions with teachers and students. One teacher described Mr. Michaels as highly visible. "He greets the students each day with handshakes and eye contact. He has a very sincere rapport, but doesn't tolerate any crap." A second teacher noted that as "an instructional leader, he's wonderful. He makes teachers feel like experts in their fields." The third teacher described Mr. Michaels as "tremendously organized, he communicates using minutes of all meetings. He's always on schedule and on time. Yet he is very caring and confidential." But she also observed that "The leadership is spread throughout the building because of all the committees."

One teacher noted that the major strength of the school was all the personnel, "so much extra help" which comes from the Schoolwide Project funding. The weaknesses were the socioeconomic factors that influence the school community. Mr. Michaels spoke extensively about the shared leadership within the building and the fact that he makes no individual decisions.

> We do have site based management in the building also. Site based management teachers, parents and myself. And we have other staff members that are represented on the site based management team. It's called the Robertson Leadership Team. They follow the master agreement. They have the ability to make any decision that I would normally make for this building. They can choose to make that decision if they want. What we've sort of come across in this building is more of a shared government model. I have a principal's report every week and I share with them recommendations, tell them what's going on and so forth. If they really want to become involved, they can become involved. Usually what we've done is set a deadline. By September 30th, they identify the areas in which they'd like to make decisions and if they have not chosen that area, then it becomes my responsibility for the year. Most teachers understand this is more than an oversee type of program to give guidance to the building. Hopefully, it's something where we're working together and it's a shared vision.

type of program to give guidance to the building. Hopefully, it's something where we're working together and it's a shared vision.

When asked to describe how he proceeds when he is faced with a major decision, Mr. Michaels responded:

> With a major decision, it's a shared decision. A major decision is a shared decision. That's the way I operate. I'm not going to solve the problem with any choice I make. If I bring all the information that is available out there and we discuss the pros, the cons, and how it's going to impact children and impact staff, we're going to have the best decision because it's shared thinking. That's how I attack. I try to give them a lot of input on decisions that are made in the building.

One teacher observed that "Mr. Michaels does not make any decisions on his own, but he may make his opinion known."

Mr. Michaels also referred to his making his opinions known but indicated that he did this primarily through sharing them with influential people in the school.

> I have my informal network. There are certain people that I know that are in power positions or in influential positions and I think when I go to them and get rationale for certain things. I think that's more helpful when it comes up for discussion because I am able to relate to them to the total impact rather than how it relates to just one person or one particular grade level, so on and so forth.

When asked about labor union concerns, Mr. Michaels asserted:

> I don't have union problems in the building. I've had a very cooperative - in fact for the last four or five years, I'm somebody who has a very cooperative union person. I always make it a priority to tell the teachers that if you have a problem, we'll try to work it out in the building. If we get to the point where we can't work it out in the building, then we'll take the next step. Most of the teachers in the building will bring their problems to me.

Two important aspects of the nature of leadership in Robertson School thus surfaced from the both the interviews with the teachers and with Mr. Michaels. One was the repeated reference to shared leadership throughout this building. The second was a belief in setting high standards for students which appeared to undergird and give direction to the work of teachers. One teacher indicated that:

> What we do is come up with certain expectations or certain goals each year as part of our traditional program. For instance, as part of the program, every child will write every day in the building. That's a goal for every classroom. Teachers will make an attempt to put aside times so that there is silent reading.

Mr. Michaels spoke of his conversations with teachers with respect to the nature of teachers'

expectations for students:

> As I tell my teachers, I think you need to have a healthy balance. In looking at the students, you're looking at the community, you're looking at the ability of the students. You need to understand that all students can achieve. All students can grow. They're not all going to grow at the same time and that's the realistic part of it they need to understand. But all these kids are important to the school.

Although shared decision making and high expectations for students seemed to characterize Robertson School, from the comments of both Mr. Michaels and teachers, it did not appear that Mr. Michaels played a significant role in planning, resource allocation, coordination, or supervision. Most of the technical functions seemed to be performed by committees. While Mr. Michaels did appear, on occasion, to let his expectations and beliefs be known, he did not appear to be playing a significant role in shaping the school culture through communicating his hopes and dreams for the school or transforming routine tasks into meaningful events imbued with values which reinforced the goals of the school. But, despite this lack of technical and symbolic leadership on the part of the principal, the staff appeared to have a shared vision for the school and various committees appeared to be performing the technical functions necessary to achieve that vision. The Robertson Leadership Team had the power to make any decision that the principal would make. The Schoolwide Project Committee made most of the decisions about curriculum and finances as they related to Title I. Committees which had less formal authority but nonetheless provided leadership with the school included a programs committee, a computer committee, the social committee, and the multicultural committee. Mr. Michael repeatedly spoke of his role as primarily being one of allowing others to set goals for the school and then supporting teachers in achieving those goals.

Overall, the interview and observational data suggested that Mr. Michaels had abrogated his role as a symbolic or technical leader. Rather, he had assumed the roles of follower and facilitator. Thus, insofar as emphasizing the symbolic and technical aspects of his work, Mr. Michaels appeared to evidence an unfocused orientation. Overall, however, many symbolic and technical leadership roles were being assumed by staff members and the school as a whole appeared to evidence a bifocal orientation.

Longfield School. The Longfield School boundary lines begin one block north of the downtown business district of one of the mid-sized urban cities in Ohio. When the downtown area was alive with businesses and shopping, this part of the city was a vital, thriving community, but as the stores closed and went to the suburbs, so did the families that once occupied the Victorian homes which characterize the neighborhood. Low socioeconomic Appalachian whites and African American families now populate the neighborhood, and the once beautiful homes were ill kept or abandoned.

This neighborhood has seen a slight boost in development in recent years as it has been the targeted area for revitalization due to its proximity to downtown and city government. The city council recently appropriated funds for parks, nuisance abatement to tear down abandoned houses, and a mounted police patrol. Several corporations as well as city employees adopted Longfield School and provided tutors, programs or funding as a way of enhancing this school.

The Longfield School building is about 25 years old. It is one of the newer schools in the central city. The original Longfield School caught fire and was replaced by the present two story brick building. which sits in the middle of one city block. Outside the front door is a playground with climbing equipment and slides. No buzzer is needed to enter Longfield School, but immediately inside the front door is the office counter where visitors are greeted by either the secretary, a security person or a parent volunteer.

The office of Greg Farmer, principal of Longfield for 9 years, was neat and organized. Family pictures and a few personal mementos adorned the cabinet behind his desk. Tacked to a bulletin board were schedules and announcements. At the top of the board was a copy of a newspaper article entitled, "Exercise or die." Very little was on Mr. Farmer's desk. As Mr. Farmer dealt with some of these materials prior to beginning the interview, he immediately filed them. As the interview progressed, he constantly organized and straightened the few pieces of paper that remained on his desk.

Mr. Farmer was disciplining a student when the interviewer arrived. He apologized for the delay and stated the interview would begin soon. One and a half an hour later, he was still

dealing with discipline referrals which were nonstop throughout the afternoon. After one discipline referral, Mr. Farmer left the office to file the referral. On his way back to the office he noticed a teacher who was having difficulty with the copy machine which sits outside his office. He stopped to add toner before continuing with the student or the interview. This was his pattern throughout the day; he would begin a task then be drawn to a different one. He was constantly interrupted by staff members who needed his attention. He was continually in motion and attended to many different jobs at the same time.

Once the interview began, Mr. Farmer spoke about his school and its diversity.

> Longfield School is an inner-city, urban school, high population of African American students, a goodly number of Hispanic students Appalachian white, even some Lebanese and a few Laotians spattered in there. A real Heinz 57 variety. Fifty-six percent mobility rate. Our kids go all over the map. This doesn't speak well for their potential to learn. Also have a high incidence of single parents in our school. Alcohol and drug abuse. But, surprisingly enough, the children are very resilient. The percentage of children that show poor manners in school is only about 10% at the very most, so I'm real proud of the way they behave in school for the most part. We have a staff that is probably seven to eight years experience. Few of them have master's degrees that I am aware of. About the same type of makeup as far as race goes. We have probably maybe 1/3 of our staff of African American and 2/3 Caucasian probably. The school tries to be a focal point in the community and the community itself around the school is a very high crime area. Lots of prostitution, felony warrants, etc. Pretty rough neighborhood. Therefore, there's lots of support groups and advocacy groups in the area so that always makes it interesting around school.

On any given day, Longfield School may have several programs or prize incentives occurring. Due to its close proximity to downtown business, Longfield has received much attention from local corporations. It was one of the first schools in the district to have a banking program. A local bank provides financial support for transportation for field trips and incentive programs. The bank employees volunteer time to tutor students as well as support student fund raising efforts. The neighborhood hospital and social service agencies also provide classroom support by way of programs and services to students. With corporation support as well as the funding from Title 1, this school has established incentives for attendance, good behavior and academics. However, in discussions with Mr. Farmer and the staff members, never once was mention made as to how these programs were coordinated so as to achieve

specific student achievement goals. Rather these programs appeared to represent disjointed and sometimes conflicting efforts.

Overall, there appeared to be no common focus or direction which provided direction for the school has a whole. The school had many resources due to community involvement. Yet with all the resources, both in people and finances, the school was experiencing great academic difficulties. Metropolitan Achievement Test scores had dropped each year over the last three years. This year, the school had the lowest scores for the entire district on the Ohio Fourth Grade Proficiency test.

When Mr. Farmer was asked to state the vision of the school, he framed his response in terms of his own personal vision rather than a shared vision.

> My vision for Longfield School is one, hopefully, revolving on technology because that's where our children are going to find jobs. I can't see beating around the bush, trying to fancy this up, and do this and do that. Social studies is fine. Science is going to be a very important part of their life too. I can't see beating too much dead horses. I think we've got to really, really stress the use of technology and group interaction. Being able to work together in groups. That's what the industry is asking for. People that can get along, that can work in groups to get things accomplished, that can show leadership from within a group. I think that's critical to our children, especially here at school because they're not going to have it on paved road. The road is not going to be very smooth. It's going to be real bumpy for them because of the lack of educated people at home to give them some guidance and some direction in their life. I'd really like to see our school, when we do get our technology, whenever that might be, to really work on information gathering, to broaden the spectrum of their education. To get far beyond the walls of our school and to really make their learning come alive, make them be lifetime learners.

Mr. Farmer also gave conflicting responses when asked whether Longfield School had a motto. His first response was made when he was first contacted and asked about the types of questions that he would be asked during the interview. At that time, he said, "I don't have time to come up with a motto. I don't believe in it. If the kids want a motto, they can come up with one of their own. It would probably be 'We kick butt.' " However, during the interview, he responded differently:

> The motto we sort of hang up and promote is "We care." We have it on our tee shirts. We have it on our book bags. We have it sprayed in the hallway. We have it in many of our newsletters. What that "We care" means is we make an analogy to a sports team,

basketball team, whatever, that the five main players are the teacher, myself, the parent, the community and finally, the student. If any of us are not doing their job, not caring to do our job, then the team is going to lose in the process of education, or the game issue, if you will, of education. Therefore, we try to promote that as much as possible. We care. Therefore, all of us need to pull our own load have a vested interest in the education of the child, including the child.

It appeared that, after some thought, Mr. Farmer had decided to respond in terms of conventional "jargon." but his initial response was an expression of his own personal belief regarding the importance of a school motto.

Mr. Farmer described his role as principal in terms of functions he would like to perform, not in terms of what he currently was doing. In his comments he alluded to the adverse effects of his workload and other negative aspects of his job as principal.

> I'd like to be the overseer of decision making, allowing the staff to many times, 90% of the time, make the decisions that affect them directly and to make a decision that's good for children. Also being an instructional leader. Wow. I'd like to be able to be that someday. To be able to be in the classroom for an hour each day. To be able to support teachers and give them positive feedback and if need be, negative feedback for their professional growth. But you know as well as I do that we're at a net issue of being that I'm alone there and the lone administrator and everything funnels down so there's not a whole lot of times I can do that. As the man said the other day at the meeting, three things for outstanding leaders, get out of your office, get out of your office, get out of your office. That's what I'm going to try to do this next year if I can. In actuality, I sort of describe myself as the sewer where anything that is not being done by other people gets done by me. It all funnels down. People in the lunch room don't like kids, they send them to me. People don't like kids in their class, they send them to me. People go on a field trip, I do the form. People want to purchase something, I do the requisition of the P.O. Kids have to go for an attendance hearing, I write the school report. People want to purchase something or deposit money, have a fund-raiser, I do that. People want to get a kid tested for special ed., I do that. You know the way it is, kid.

The preceding response was one of several indications that Mr. Farmer believed he had to control and be involved in everything in this school. For example, he also talked about how he organized and inventoried the book room and then locked it so the teachers could not "mess it up." He noted that teachers were required come to him if they needed materials. He also stated that he monitored each teachers' allotment of the number of copies which could be made through the district printing office.

Mr. Farmer indicated he believed that organization was the key to performing his job

well.

> I'm very organized. That's important. When a person needs to get some information, you should be able to put your hands on that material within two minutes. If you can't, you're not organized enough. You've got to get better because organization is the key to all administration at the management end. If you're going to keep from getting on a tall chair and have a short rope around your neck.

Mr. Farmer viewed his organizational abilities as an asset, but one teacher observed that his need to "check things off his " 'to do' list" made for hurried and inconsistent decision making.

> He speaks before he thinks. He just wants to get things taken care of and so he reacts just to get a problem out of the way. He is then inconsistent in how he handles problems and how he deals with kids.

Numerous discrepancies were revealed in comparing teachers' perceptions of Mr. Farmer and Mr. Farmer's perceptions of himself. Mr. Farmer saw himself as an overseer of decision making and a people person who supported his teachers. Nonetheless, Mr. Farmer acknowledged that, when the staff members evaluated him this year, they identified problems with his interactions with the teachers. However, he still maintained that his relationships with teachers were collaborative.

> The staff says I try to avoid them. The fact that I don't have the time to go and sit in the lounge and gab with them. I'm a workaholic in that mode. I think my leadership style is also one of collaboration.

Although all three staff members interviewed believed they had good working relationships with Mr. Farmer, their interview statements did not support Mr. Farmer's perceptions of himself as a collaborator. One of the teachers described Mr. Farmer in the following manner:

> Greg pretty much likes to be on top of things, he's on every committee. He controls everything. He will listen, but it's more his way. He will word things so he gets his way. Lots of teachers are afraid of him, they just will not talk to him. They get others to talk to him. Teachers won't volunteer for anything because they are afraid he will snap at them.

Another teacher stated:

> There would be a lot more [union] grievances against him because he's always doing something he shouldn't, but the teachers are too afraid of him. They'd have to live with him after they did it [file a grievance].

The nature of schoolwide leadership was also discussed by Mr. Farmer. He said his teachers would go along with any program he wanted to begin, but no one would take on leadership responsibility. He viewed the union mentality of not helping the administration as the source of the problem.

> The third roadblock is a given. The teachers' union. If you try to do anything that's new and innovative, or whatever, or at all questioning personnel, right away they throw cold water on it and put a roadblock in there.

One teacher spoke of Mr. Farmer's moodiness and unapproachability with both the staff and the students.

> Everyone knows when he has a bad day. We even will check with the secretary before we approach him. The building rep has even had to talk to him about his moodiness. With kids he's not real patient. He doesn't always follow through. He may issue an intent to suspend, but then the next time the student comes in to his office, he doesn't do anything with him. He's not consistent, He may suspend for minor offenses but others who are major problems he forgets about. In his heart he thinks he's right, but not for these kids. If there are staff members he doesn't like, it's obvious, He'll jump on them for little things.

Another teacher viewed him as very organized but also commented on his need for control and lack of approachability.

> Greg is very organized. He handles things immediately. He knows what needs to be done, who needs to do it and when it needs to be done. He knows all the students and visits the classrooms once a month. He is domineering. He knows what he wants and moves to get it. He pushes to get his ways. Sometimes he's approachable, but if you catch him wrong, he'll react. He's always done a lot for me, but he's not that way with everyone. I know when I approach him I get what I need, but others don't get support from him.

This teacher continued by saying that she has learned to judge his moods and thus approaches him in the following manner:

> I say to him, let me tell you what I want to do so you can think about it and get back with me. This works for me almost every time with him.

She indicated that she had found that using this technique enabled her to get what she needed from him without making him angry.

Mr. Farmer himself addressed the issue of his temper when commenting on his most prominent leadership attributes.

> I think I'm really a people person. Normally I do not get at odds with other people. I'm

not a fighter. I'm a person that tries to get along with everyone. Unless someone just ticks me off, then I'll kick them good in the butt.

All three staff members believed that Mr. Farmer worked hard and, in his own way, had the best interest of the school and the children at heart. However, they all pointed out that his moodiness, his quick temper in reacting to teachers and problems, and his need to be in control were major concerns with respect to the nature of his leadership.

Overall, neither Mr. Farmer's or teachers' responses indicated that either Mr. Farmer or other members of the staff were providing symbolic leadership which enabled the school to develop a shared vision and a culture which supported that vision. Nor did Mr. Farmer or staff members appear to be giving attention to such technical functions as setting long and short term goals, allocating resources to maximize instructional outcomes, coordinating programmatic efforts, or dealing with conflicts. Mr. Farmer appeared to be primarily concerned with maintaining order and control. Teachers appeared to be primarily concerned with performing their day-to-day- duties without incurring Mr. Farmer's anger. Both Mr. Farmer and the school as a whole appeared to evidence an unfocused leadership orientation.

Summary of findings relating to leadership orientations. In the effective school headed by a bifocal principal (as identified by the PBI), analysis of the interview and observation data indicated that both the principal and the school as a whole evidenced a bifocal orientation. In this school, the principals and most teachers worked together with a single purpose, for students to learn, giving balanced attention to both the technical and symbolic dimensions of their work.

In the effective school headed by an unfocused principal (as identified by the PBI), analysis of the interview and observation data also indicated that the principal was unfocused but that the school as a whole was bifocal. In this school, leadership appeared to be diffused throughout the school staff. Various committees provided symbolic and technical leadership that enabled the school to develop a shared vision and foster student achievement.

In the ineffective school headed by a bifocal principal (as identified by the PBI-P),

analysis of the interview and observation data also indicated that the principal was bifocal but that the school as a whole evidenced an unfocused orientation. Teachers were preoccupied with demands placed upon them by the central administration to implement a new curriculum and take part in an intensive two-year training program. Although they expressed a desire to have a greater voice in decision making, they demonstrated little initiative in that respect. Although the efforts of the principal of two years to exercise bifocal leadership seemed to be having a positive impact, the school culture continued to be characterized by a legacy of chaos and union mistrust stemming from actions of previous principals and the central administration.

In the ineffective school headed by an unfocused principal (as identified by the PBI-P), analysis of the interview and observation data indicated that both the principal and the school as a whole evidenced an unfocused leadership orientation. The principal was preoccupied with performing what he viewed as necessary tasks but did not link these tasks to long-term goals or evidence any concern for developing a shared vision for the school and a culture which supported that vision. The principal made most decisions without staff involvement and was inconsistent in the manner in which he made decisions. Teachers appeared either to be insensitive to the overall implications of the principal's leadership with respect to building a shared sense of purpose or reluctant to challenge the principal's leadership for fear of reprisal.

Overall, the findings of the second phase of this study indicated that, although the leadership orientations of the principals differed, both of the effective schools evidenced a bifocal schoolwide leadership orientation and both of the ineffective schools evidenced an unfocused schoolwide leadership orientation.

Summary of the findings relating to contextual variables. Findings of this study revealed a number of commonalities which characterized the effective schools as compared to those which characterized ineffective schools. Specifically, the effective schools:

- Evidenced clear achievement goals and high expectations for student achievement
- Evidenced a high level of parent involvement
- Evidenced a high level of shared decision making

- Evidenced few union-related problems.

In contrast, the ineffective schools:

- Evidenced a lack of focus on student outcomes and student achievement goals
- Evidenced a low level of parent involvement
- Evidenced a high level of concern with respect to how decisions were made
- Evidenced numerous union-related problems.

Discussion

Findings of this study lend additional support to the validity of the PBI in measuring the extent to which principals emphasize the symbolic and technical aspects of leadership. The findings also support findings of previous studies which indicated that some principals do not emphasize either the symbolic or technical aspects of leadership (Reed, Smith, & Beekley, 1996, 1997; Smith, 1996). Perhaps more importantly, however, findings of this study suggest that schools which, as a whole, do not give adequate attention to both the symbolic and technical aspects of leadership are less likely to be effective.

Results of this study also suggest that more attention needs to be given to examining the interactive relationship between principals' leadership and features of their schools. As Hallinger and Heck (1997) noted, principals may need to take into consideration contextual considerations and adjust their leadership behavior accordingly. The emphasis principals place upon various aspects of their symbolic and leadership roles may need to vary in different contexts. For example, a high level of union related problems such as those identified in two schools in this study, may, in part be attributable to principals' failure to give special attention to their technical role as jurists by developing "just and systematic procedures for dealing with conflicts that arise" and making "sure that interest groups do not abuse their power" (Deal and Peterson, 1994, p. 22). A legacy of chaos, such as that inherited by one of the principals in this study, may call for principals to give special attention to the symbolic role of healer so as to "mitigate wounds of the past and current conflicts to keep the social fabric whole (Deal and Peterson, 1994,p. 36). And, possibly, even though the school currently has a bifocal

leadership orientation, as was the case in one effective school in this study, if principals abrogate their responsibility for providing symbolic and technical leadership, over time others in the school may do likewise.

Lastly, it may be important to note that this study examined principals' leadership orientations only as they related to one dimension of organizational effectiveness, goal attainment. But, as Hoy and Miskel (1987) have indicated, there are other dimensions of organizational effectiveness. These include adaptation (flexibility, innovation, growth, and development), integration (satisfaction, employee turnover, conflict-cohesion, climate, open communication), and latency (staff loyalty, central life interests, sense of identity, motivation, role and norm congruency). Moreover, it may be important to reiterate that results of many previous studies which have been concerned with determining the effects of principals' leadership on school processes and outcomes (e.g., Goldring & Pasternak, 1994; Hallinger et al., 1990; Leithwood, Jantzi, Silins, & Dart, 1993; Leithwood, 1994; Silins, 1994) have indicated that principals' leadership may be more indirect than direct in nature. Future studies which focus on determining how principals' leadership orientations may directly or indirectly impact on other dimensions of organizational effectiveness such as adaptation, integration, and latency would thus seem to be justified.

References

Anderson, G. (1991). Cognitive politics in principals and teachers: Ideological control in an elementary school. In J. Blase (Ed.) The politics of life in schools: Power, conflict, and cooperation. (pp. 120-138). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Aviolio, B. & Bass, (1988). Transformational leadership: Charisma and beyond. In J. Hunt, B. Baliga, H. Dacheler, & C. Shriesheim (Eds.), Emerging leadership vistas (pp. 29-49) Toronto: Lexington Books.

Bamburg, J. & Andrews, R. (1990) School goals, principals and Achievement. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 2,175-191.

Blase, J. (1993). The micropolitics of effective school-based leadership: Teachers' perspectives. Educational Administration Quarterly, 29, 142-163.

Brewer, A. (1993). Principals and student outcomes: Evidence from U.S. high Schools. Economics of Education Review, 12, 281-292.

Burns, J.M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

Eberts, R. & Stone, J. (1988). Student Achievement in public schools: Do principals make a difference? Economics of Education Review,7, 291-299.

Deal T. E. & Peterson, K.D. (1994). The leadership paradox: Balancing logic and artistry in schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gardner, H. (1995a, September 13). A cognitive view of leadership. Education Week. pp. 34-35.

Gardner, H. (1995b). Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership. New York: Basic Books.

Goldring, E. & Pasternak, R. (1994). Principals' coordinating strategies and school effectiveness. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 5, 239-253.

Hallinger, P., Bickman, L, & Davis, K. (1990).What makes a difference? School context, principal leadership and student achievement. Occasional paper #3. The National Center for Educational Leadership, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Hallinger, P. & Heck, R. (1996a). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of the empirical research, 1980-1995. Educational Administration Quarterly, 30, 472-497.

Hallinger, P. & Heck, R. (1996b). The principal's role in school effectiveness: An assessment of methodological progress, 1980-1995. In K. Leithwood et al. (Ed.), International handbook of research in educational leadership and administration. New York: Kluwer Press.

Hallinger, P & Heck, R. (1997, March). Epistemological frames and methods for the study of school leadership. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Heck, R. & Brandon, P. (1995). Teacher empowerment and the implementation of school-based reform. Empowerment in Organizations: An International Journal, 3, 10-19.

Heck, R., Larsen, T., & Marcoulides, G. (1990). Principal instructional leadership and school achievement: Validation of a causal model. Educational Administration Quarterly, 26, 94-125.

Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. G. (1987). Organizational effectiveness. In W. K. Hoy & C. G. Miskel, Educational administration: Theory, research and practice (3rd Edition), (pp. 386-421). New York: Random House.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., Silins, H., & Dart, B. (1993). Using the appraisal of school leaders as an instrument for school restructuring. Peabody Journal of Education, 68, 85-109.

Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. Educational Administration Quarterly, 30, 498-518.

Ogawa, R.T. & Bossert, S.T. (1995). Leadership as an organizational quality. Educational Administration Quarterly, 31, 224-243.

Reed, P., Smith, M., Kasch, A., & Sanders, E. (1995, October). An investigation of principals' leadership orientations. Paper presented at the University Council for Educational Administration Convention, Salt Lake City, UT.

Reed, P., Smith, M., & Beekley, C. (1996, October). An investigation of the leadership

orientations of Ohio secondary school principals. Paper presented at the University Council for Educational Administration Convention, Louisville, KY.

Reed, P., Smith, M., & Beekley, C. (1997, March). A quantitative and qualitative study of principals' leadership orientations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Reitzig, U. C.. (1994). [Review of the book The leadership paradox:: Balancing logic and artistry in schools]. Educational Administration Quarterly, 30, 525-530.

Scott, C. & Teddlie, C. (1987, April). Student, teacher, and principal academic expectations and attributed responsibility as predictors of student achievement: A causal modeling approach. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington D.C.

Silins, H. (1994). The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and school improvement outcomes. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 5, 272-298.

Table 1

Summary of Demographic Information

School Code	Principals' Number of Years of Education	Principals' Number of Years in Admin.	Number of Years in Schoolwide Project	Number of Students in Building	Gender of Principal	Grade Levels in Building
301	27	20	4	533	F	K-6
302	28	17	4	350	M	K-3
305	25	10	4	200	F	K-6
306	22	10	4	590	M	K-5
307	22	10	2	400	F	K-2
402	28	6	2	630	F	K-6
413	32	16	4	663	F	K-5
417	25	9	4	424	M	K-6

Table 2

Annual Report Information

Category	Robertson Achievement	Mayfair Park	Conway Primary	Longfield
Grades Served	K-5	K-6	PreK-3	K-6
Enrollment	541	630	421	441
Attendance Rate	94.27%	92.16%	92.9%	81%
Ethnic Diversity of Students	33.3%	21.8%	2.6%	25%
White/Caucasian	65.2%	74.2%	96.4%	61%
Black/African American	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0%
American Indian	0.4%	1.7%	0.2%	1%
Asian	1.1%	1.3%	0.7%	13%
Hispanic				
Free/Reduced Lunch	89%	91%	89%	84%
Gender of Students				
Male	48.4%	53.4%	52%	50%
Female	51.6%	47.6%	48%	50%
Number of Teachers	30	.33	25	30
Ethnic Diversity of Staff				
White/Caucasian	83%	75%	66.6%	84%
Black/African American	17%	25%	33.4%	13%
Hispanic	0%	0%	0.0%	3%
Gender of Staff				
Male	14%	13%	15%	21%
Female	86%	87%	85%	79%
Average Years of Experience	12.3	8.8	16	13

Table 3

Categorization of Principals

Leadership Orientation	Description
Symbolic	Principals with standard scores above the mean for the symbolic responses and below the mean for technical responses on the PBI-P were identified as having a symbolic leadership orientation.
Technical	Principals with standard scores above the mean for the technical responses and below the mean for symbolic responses on the PBI-P were identified as having a technical leadership orientation.
Bifocal	Principals with standard scores above the mean for both the technical and symbolic responses on the PBI-P were identified as having a bifocal leadership orientation.
Unfocused	Principals with standard scores below the mean for both the technical and symbolic responses on the PBI-P were identified as having an unfocused leadership orientation.

Table 4

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Principals' Technical and Symbolic Responses to PBI-P

Responses	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation
Technical	3.89	0.39
Symbolic	3.91	0.41

Note. $N = 8$.

Table 5

Mean Scores and Standard Scores as Reported on the PBI-P

School Code	Symbolic Mean	Technical Mean	z Symbolic	z Technical
301	3.6	4.2	-0.75	0.87
302	4.2	4.4	0.63	1.29
305	3.8	3.9	-0.26	-0.06
306	3.5	3.5	-0.99	-0.99
307	4.3	3.5	0.96	-0.99
402	4.6	4.3	1.77	1.12
413	4.2	4.4	0.79	1.29
417	3.6	3.4	-0.75	-1.16

Table 6

Identification of Principal Leadership Orientation in Relation to Standing in Title 1 Schoolwide Project

Principal Code	Leadership Orientation	Title 1 Classification
301	Technical	Effective
302	Bifocal	Effective
305	Unfocused	Effective
306	Unfocused	Effective
307	Symbolic	Effective
402	Bifocal	Non Effective
413	Bifocal	Non Effective
417	Unfocused	Non Effective

Table 7

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Technical and Symbolic Responses on the PBI-T

Response	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Technical	3.99	0.31
Symbolic	3.65	0.91

Table 8

Mean Scores and Standard Scores for Technical and Symbolic Responses on the PBI-T

School Code	Symbolic Mean	Technical Mean	z Symbolic	z Technical
301	4.3	4.1	0.72	0.47
302	3.8	4.2	0.15	0.65
305	3.0	3.9	-0.71	-0.30
306	2.9	3.9	-0.82	-0.18
307	4.0	3.9	0.35	-0.29
402	4.6	4.3	1.09	1.04
413	3.4	3.9	-0.31	-2.33
417	2.4	4.2	-1.35	-0.39

Table 9

Identification of Leadership Orientations Based on the PBI-P and the PBI-T

School Code	PBI-P Orientation	PBI-T Orientation
301	Technical	Bifocal
302	Bifocal	Bifocal
305	Unfocused	Unfocused
306	Unfocused	Unfocused
307	Symbolic	Symbolic
402	Bifocal	Bifocal
413	Bifocal	Unfocused
417	Unfocused	Unfocused

APPENDIX A

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. How would you describe your school to someone who knows nothing about it?
2. What are two outstanding features of your school?
3. Define your role as principal.
4. What are two of your most prominent leadership attributes?
5. Please talk a little about your philosophy in regard to educational leadership.
6. What is your vision for your school? Is that a shared building vision or your personal vision?
7. Is there a school motto or slogan that everyone in your school and community knows?
8. How would your staff describe your leadership style?
9. What are two things you would change about your school?
10. Are there some major barriers or roadblocks that inhibit improvement in your school? If so, what are they?
11. When faced with a major decision, how do you attack the problem?
12. Who else in your building provides leadership? In what sense or capacity?

APPENDIX B

TEACHER INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

TEACHER INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. What are your impressions of your school in terms of strengths and weaknesses?
2. What is the role of the principal in terms of providing leadership for the school?
3. Who else in the building provides leadership?